

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present case. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Applicants prior art Figure 1. Claims 2-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants prior art Figure 1 in view of Donahue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,717B1).

102 Rejection

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Applicants' prior art Figure 1. The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claim 1 is neither shown nor suggested by Applicants' prior art Figure 1.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a display assembly for a portable electronic device comprising:

... a digitizer mechanism comprising a top film and a resistive digitizer element; and a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said top film of said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism ...

Applicants' prior art Figure 1 does not anticipate or render obvious an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly comprising "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said top film of said digitizer

mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism” as is recited in Claim 1. By contrast, Applicants prior art Figure 1 only shows a touch screen assembly that comprises a digitizer mechanism and an outermost protective film wherein the outermost protective film merely covers the digitizer film. However, Applicants’ Claim 1 sets forth specific attributes of the therein recited cover enclosure that are not shown or suggested by Applicants prior art Figure 1. For example, nowhere in Applicants prior art Figure 1 is there shown a cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses a cover film. Consequently, the Applicants’ invention as is recited in Claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Applicants’ prior art Figure 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants’ prior art does not show or suggest the embodiment of the Applicants’ invention as is set forth in Claim 1 and, as such, Claim 1 overcomes the cited art of record under 35 U.S.C. §102. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

103 Rejections

Claims 2-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants’ prior art in view of Donahue et al. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-20 are neither shown nor suggested by Applicants’ prior art in view of Donahue et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to an integrated/enclosure touch screen assembly comprising:

... a digitizer mechanism comprising a top film and a resistive digitizer element; and a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over said top film of and encloses said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism ...

Independent Claims 9 and 16 recite distinguishing limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-8 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 10-15 depend from independent Claim 9, and Claims 17-20 depend from independent Claim 16 and recite further features of the present invention.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest the embodiments set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16. Applicants prior art Figure 1 does not anticipate or render obvious an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly comprising “a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said top film of said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism” as is recited in Claim 1, and similar limitations of Claims 9 and 16. By contrast, Applicants prior art Figure 1 only shows a touch screen assembly that comprises a digitizer mechanism and an outermost protective film wherein the outermost protective film merely covers the digitizer film. However, Applicants’ Claim 1 sets forth specific attributes of the therein recited cover enclosure that are not shown or suggested

by Applicants prior art Figure 1. For example, nowhere in Applicants prior art Figure 1 is there shown a cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses a cover film.

Consequently, the Applicants invention as recited in Claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Applicants prior art Figure 1.

The cited combination does not render obvious Claim 1 because Donohue et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Applicants prior art Figure 1 noted above. Donohue does not render obvious an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly comprising “a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said top film of said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism” as is recited in Claim 1, and similar limitations of Claims 9 and 16. By contrast, Donohue only shows a Kiosk touch pad. However, Applicants’ Claim 1 sets forth specific attributes of the therein recited cover enclosure that are not shown or suggested by Donohue. For example, nowhere in Applicants prior art Figure 1 or Donohue et al. is there shown a cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses a cover film. As such, the Donahue et al. reference simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching. Consequently, Donohue et al. either alone or in combination with Applicants prior art Figure 1 does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants prior art Figure 1 and Donahue et al. either alone or in combination do not show or suggest the Applicants invention as is set forth in Claims 1, 9, and 16 and, as such, Claims 1, 9, and 16 traverse the Examiner’s basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that Claims 2-8 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10-15 dependent on Claim 9, and Claim 17-20 dependent on Claim 16 likewise traverse the Examiners basis for rejection as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are themselves in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending Claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Reginald A. Ratliff at (408) 938-9060.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO
& HAO LLP

Dated: 8/19, 2003


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No.: 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060